

AFW Irrigation Districts Executive Committee Meeting

Date: October 19, 2000

Location: Ellensburg Inn, Ellensburg

Attendees: See attendee list.

1. Approval of July Minutes:

- The minutes were approved as is and are ready to post on the website by close of business tomorrow (10/20).

2. Overview of DRAFT Guidelines:

- Tom M. and Paula S. walked the Exec. Cmte. through an overview of the DRAFT Guidelines manual detailing any changes made:

Forward:

- Jim P. had sent another version of the forward with the goals and objectives highlighted. Jim offered new language feeling the current goals and objectives were too broad. He's trying to look beyond just salmon.
- As suggested, rather than reopen the language, perhaps in other parts of the forward incorporate Jim's language. It was pointed out that the goals and objectives can be rewritten several times and never satisfy everyone. The 3rd paragraph would be a good spot to include "ecological improvement" within the body. Jim P. and the committee agreed.
- The question, what does "meaningful" mean was asked? It was reflected as an issue for the state. Feels it won't add clarity to the document. Definition could be different based on the eyes of the beholder. Jim doesn't feel "harvestable" is sufficient. They want "harvestable practices."
- It was suggested as a possibility to include what harvestable means to the tribes in the first paragraph. "Meaningful" would be difficult for the IDs to digest. Possible "cultural needs" or "tribal needs".

Chapter 1:

- In the near future, the introduction will be an intro to the document plus the included text. **Tom M.** will be writing that part soon.

Chapter 2:

- As pointed out, 4d requires NEPA but Sec. 7 does not. There's a question for NEPA/SEPA under 4(d). Needs to be screened.
- Page 12 – 14 will be scrubbed for ESA text and CWA text will be moved to the front.

- Page 15 – 17 will be moved back to the assessment chapter with a paragraph that refers to Ch. 6 on page 15 after a discussion with Karl H.
- It was suggested to get the document out for public review, with it being rough, as soon as possible. Put a draft watermark on it, letting them know that it is a work in progress but please comment. Gaps that are existing might be an opportunity for help from the rest of the workgroup before it is sent out. An overall edit for redundancy and completed assignments need to be given to Paula S. as soon as possible before it is sent out.

Chapter 3:

- The Technical Advisory Team (TAT) will be developed from the various agencies. Agencies get to decide what the team looks like. The issue of resourcing the TAT needs to be addressed for future reference. All contact information needs to be given to Paula S. for the agencies under the contact section with the inclusion of affected Tribes under the TAT core agencies.
- A check needs to be done to see if there is anything stated that says the Fed. agencies are the formal approving agencies. The reader needs to be reference to the compliance pathway.

Chapter 4:

- Any questions on the IDs operations that they are seeking coverage for can be answered in this chapter.

Chapter 5:

- Some members from the workgroup are working with Steve Leider to correlate the assessment process with the watershed process. Baseline thinking is articulated as being right on target. A narrow focus for the IDs is workable but once you begin a regional scope, that's too much to tackle.
- JNRC is meeting next Tuesday to look at 6 different assessment tools to see what fits best for the watershed assessment. Hopefully it will begin to fill the holes. Policy level will need to decide how far we move with assessments. The workgroup will try to get Steve Leider to one of the meetings to brief the group.
- It was asked whether we want to include the background in Ch. 5 with the meat in Ch. 6. It was decided by the IDs to leave the chapters separate but include a directional statement at the end of this chapter to move them to the next section for the meat.

Chapter 6:

- Still needs some internal review within the Fed. services before it becomes final, remembering that this is a pilot project. The chapter really takes into account what there is already established out there. Although this is a different way to look at this info, the info is really not new. The IDs articulated that the format is good for their use.
- “Area action” is defined in the glossary, but is also being added to the text by **Karl H.**

Chapter 7:

- Should this be integrated into Ch. 2 or an appendix? Good reference material for an appendix. Decision: Ch. 7 will become an appendix in the back of the document.

- The focus for this document should be a “How To” instead of a reference document. The executive summary should become a purpose section that **Tom M.** will be writing. All education/history material should be included into the appendix with just the steps being included into the body. The appendix should be bigger than the body when finished.

Chapter 8:

- A stab has been taken at identifying what our monitoring steps might be. Input is needed from folks on questions and objectives on monitoring at a state and fed level. Dick W. offered to have his monitoring folks help, but cautioned on getting too detailed because it's based on site-specific situations. Maybe we can come up with objectives that can be added. Discussion on who is doing the monitoring needs to happen. Who's going to do what needs to be defined. TAT has been defined as an ongoing team who would participate in the monitoring and how does the information get back to the oversight team.
- It was suggested that there's several ways to deal with adaptive management and monitoring. Applicant may be asked to do the monitoring but depends on money. How close do you want to draw the line at being successful? It's not all solvable at this point.

Chapter 9:

- The IDs are asked how the steps of the plan will be funded in this chapter. Where will the dollars come from that will move the overall plan? An appendix will be added to reference the funding book that was put together by the AFW staff. Sec. 10 has a requirement that you have to show that you are able to implement with funding.

Chapter 10:

- Text was lifted from NMFS' typical implementing agreement. USFWS will run the text by their HCP office to see if there are any differences between the two services. Historically they've been on the same page. It's not encouraged to have differences between the services. The agreement text should be placed in the appendix.

Chapter 11:

- Flexibility is the key. Text hasn't changed since it was last seen. Public Involvement Models: Remove Gypsy Moth and change “State Mgmt.” to “Shoreline Mgmt.” act. Reference the Mid-Columbia HCP as a good model.

3. Instream Flow Paper:

- As charged from the Okanogan EC meeting, an instream flow technical team and a white paper were developed, with an introductory paragraph and some policy principals.
- The IDs would like to start out without specifically stating that flows are a problem. One fear that they have is when IDs have a very defined area this could push them outside their boundaries. The districts shouldn't be held responsible for all the ills of a system. That fear is real among the districts. Many feel the white paper needs to be rewritten in such a way that elaborates that there are many problems within a system and the IDs are willing to step forward and help. Also, that lack of flows are contributed by many problems, out of the reach of a CIDMP. The contribution asked to be made might be perceived as unreasonable. Translate into the white paper a descriptive narrative that would explain this situation. What's the equitable share? There's a perception because of the IDs

diversion, that they will be asked to share the recovery burden.

- How do we get there? This is a big issue that will need to be worked through. Elaboration needs to be made. A clear understanding needs to be made on what the perceived fears are really about. Workable fears need to be fully understood. Each ID may have different fears depending on their situation. A pilot project showing that the IDs and agencies can work together would be helpful.
- Carefully crafted wording needs to be developed to describe this sensitive issue with further guidance from the IDs. How does this get incorporated into the CIDMP? Tom is looking for a principal or statement of intent. **Tom M.** will work with **Dick W. & Dale B.** in re-crafting the white paper, which will be put into the guidelines, up-front to the assessment chapter. Definitions need to be made and **Jodi B.** will send comments.

4. Guidelines/Compliance Pathway Discussion:

- How do we officially recognize the guidelines document with compliance pathways? IDs looking for the federal agencies to concur that this plan has substance that districts are working towards a CIDMP. Do we want to build elements of a TMDL for CWA compliance or just not violate the standards? If you violate your then in a TMDL mode. CWA is simpler and compliance is easy, but water quality standards can change. Agree to this guide, place as a 4(d) amendment. If the CIDMPs are done correctly, up front individual NEPA review won't be necessary.
- Flip Chart Notes:
 - 4(d) – Guidelines Document
 - Officially recognized as a “good guidance” for CIDMPs
 - NEPA at front end → Prog/EIS – Just notice CIDMPs
 - Sec. 10 HCP
 - Individual HCP – “Expedited” HCP? Build off assessment, Sec. 4(d). Sec. 7
 - Programmatic/Certification of ID
 - Sec. 7
 - Col. Basin, Yakima – Underway...done before CIDMPs?
 - CWA recognition/Integration w/ ESA
 - Meet WQs, BMPs
 - TMDL
 - ESA/CWA link (4d, 10)
- 4(d) process – Gain recognition from the services, apply and get CIDMP 4(d) coverage, approval with limitations, only for threatened species.
- CWA – The best way to get certainty is to follow water quality standards. TMDLs are in the guidelines. Simpson has integrated ESA and CWA. Referenced in document. 80% of the time, if you are meeting ESA, you're meeting CWA.

5. Sec. 7 Consultation:

- Yakima BA has been submitted for review with the services. Salmon Creek has passed the Senate and is currently waiting in the House, rumor is thumbs up.

- Sec. 7 can be worked two ways: project by project or systematic. There's really not as much flexibility with Sec. 7 as there appears to be. What we want the Sec. 7 to do is really up to the group. It's not up to the agencies to require one to consult.
- The USBOR has control over the diversions, but the IDs have control over the return flows. Sec. 7 is the overarching option.

6. Funding Implementation Strategy:

- Goal is to have at least three pilots; small, medium, and large. Needs assessments; how many districts would be interested in pilot project money? Several districts could be interested in piloting. Ballpark figure: \$200,000 - \$250,000.
- Trying to get at a magnitude of what we're looking at. Proposals at some level will need to be presented at this point to even think about receiving money. Salmon recovery money has been asked for 10 times over. A tight package will be needed.
- Under DOE's 319 & Centennial funding programs, there could be an option for those that have proposals ready to go by Jan./Feb. A small group may want to be pulled together to start looking at funding options (Jan/Feb) and Tom M. might want to start looking at which IDs would be pilots (early December). Funding assessment needs to be completed by the end of the year.
- Flip Chart Notes:
 - Identify needs and specific pilots (December)
 - Workgroup formed (Dec. – Feb.)
 - Optional Funding Sources (Current & New):
 - Ref. 38
 - 319
 - SRFBD
 - Power Council

7. Document Review Timeline:

- Nov. 2nd – Individual edits (fill in the holes) need to be given to Paula S.
- Nov. 16th – Workgroup internal review.
- Nov. 30th – Services internal review.
- Draft document on the street for review by the end of November. The workgroup needs to identify who the draft goes out to for review and how long. (Communication strategy)

8. Future EC/Workgroup Meetings:

- Workgroup Mtg. – Nov. 17th and Dec. 18th (Locations TBD)
- ID Exec. Cmte. Mtg. – Jan. 4th (Location TBD)

Attendee List
October 19, 2000

Name:	Organization:
Bambrick, Dale	NMFS
Beich, Dennis	WDFW
Briscoe, Lynn	WSDA
Bush, Jodi	USFWS
Crerar, Linda	WSDA
Evans, Dan	GTH
Gray, Bill	USBR
Kaumheimer, Dave	USBR
Konovsky, John	WSCC
Landino, Steve	NMFS
Leib, Brian	WSU
Millam, Phil	EPA
Myrum, Tom	WSWRA
Noble, Sandy	USFWS
Priest, Jim	Colville Tribes
Ready, Carol	Kittitas Cty. Water Purveyors
Robinson, Bill	Trout Unlimited
Robison, Dan	EPA
Rundlett, Mike	WSCC
Samuelson, Carl	WDFW
Schwisow, Mike	WSWRA
Smitch, Curt	Governor's Office
Smith, Paula	WSCC
Teeley, Joel	WRD
Thomas, Jeff	USFWS
Wallace, Dick	DOE